



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Co. v. Sawyer, 160 Mass. 413; *Stuart v. Live Stock Ins. Co.*, 38 N. J. L. 436. In the principal case a penalty is provided for non-compliance with the statute and this raises a point concerning which the courts are almost evenly divided, but while a great number hold that such statutes are nevertheless intended as a prohibition against doing business before compliance with the conditions and that contracts made without such compliance and in violation of the statute are none the less illegal and unenforceable, *State v. Briggs*, 116 Ind. 55; *Thorne v. Travelers' Ins. Co.*, 80 Pa. St. 15, 21 Am. Rep. 89; *Cary-Lombard Lumber Co. v. Thomas*, 92 Tenn. 587; *Aetna Ins. Co. v. Harvey*, 11 Wis. 398, the weight of authority seems to be that the penalty so prescribed is exclusive and that contracts of foreign corporations made without complying with the requirements of the statute may be enforced. *R. R. Co. v. Evans*, 66 Fed. 809, 31 U. S. App. 432; *Fire Ins. Ass'n v. Stave & Heading Co.*, 61 Ark. 1, 54 Am. St. Rep. 191; *Kindel v. Lithographing Co.*, 19 Col. 310, 314; *Fire Ins. Co. v. Whipple*, 61 N. H. 61; *Garrett Ford Co. v. Vermont Mfg. Co.*, 20 R. I. 189, 78 Am. St. Rep. 852; *Edison Gen. Electrical Co. v. Navigation Co.*, 8 Wash. 370, 40 Am. St. Rep. 910; *Toledo Fire & Lumber Co. v. Thomas*, 33 W. Va. 566, 25 Am. St. Rep. 925.

EMINENT DOMAIN—WHAT CONSTITUTES A PUBLIC USE.—The plaintiff sought an injunction to restrain the condemnation of a strip of land. The land was to be subsequently resold by the city with building restrictions to preserve light, view, appearance, etc., for an adjoining public park. The condemnation was authorized by statute and ordinance. *Held*, that the legislative acts were unconstitutional, the property not being taken for a public use. *Penn. Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Phila.* (Pa. 1913), 88 Atl. 904.

The instant case may be distinguished from *Atty. Gen. v. Williams*, 174 Mass. 476, 55 N. E. 77, the leading case on the condemnation of the right to light, air, etc. In the latter case, the court allowed the taking of the easement alone, while in the principal case, the council attempted to go further and take the property itself. Were the decision based upon the ground that more was taken than was necessary, it would undoubtedly be sound. *Shawnee Co. Commrs. v. Beckwith*, 10 Kas. 603; *Taylor v. Balt.* 45 Md. 576; *Clark v. Worcester*, 125 Mass. 226; *Wash. Cem. v. Prospect Park and C. I. R. Co.*, 68 N. Y. 591. But the court reaches its conclusion by defining a public use to be an actual use, or a right to actual use by the public. What constitutes a public use is a question which has provided a great variety of answers. The decisions may, however, be divided into two general groups, those taking the position above stated, and those declaring a public use to be that use which inures in any way to the public benefit or advantage. An excellent note on the general subject, and full citation of authorities for each of the above positions will be found in 22 L. R. A. (N. S.) 20 et seq.

EVIDENCE—PUBLIC RECORDS—PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS.—X took out a policy in the relator Insurance Co. A few months later he was committed to the Michigan Asylum for the Insane. Immediately thereafter the Insurance company filed a bill in chancery to cancel the policy, alleging that it had been secured by false and fraudulent representations. X died while suit was